REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated October 6, 2005, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,005,845 (Svennesson et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,930 (McConnell et al.). Claims 2-4, 8, 13, 14, 16, and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svennesson et al. and McConnell et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,483,588 (Eaton et al).

By the present response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-18 and 20-24 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svennesson et al. in view of McConnell et al. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of Svennessom et al. in Applicant's previously-filed response and reasserts all arguments submitted in that response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

McConnell et al. discloses monitoring telecommunications traffic. When a switch receives a call request, the switch sends a query message to a service controller. The service controller identifies the call request as a request to place a special service call and therefore returns to the switch a special service code, which causes the switch to route the call via a special

loop around circuit to a destination. A signaling pad associated with the loop around circuit

passes through a designated network entity, which can therefore monitor the start and end of the

call. An SCP or other network entity can then take appropriate action in response to the status

of the call. The invention is particularly useful in facilitating robust account balance service such

as prepaid calling.

Regarding claims 1, 9, 15 and 22, Applicant submits that none of cited references, taken

alone or any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the

combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, setting a direct route between the SSP and the

IP, or announcing the service to a subscriber using the direct route between the SSP and the IP,

without using the SCP to announce the service and collecting and processing subscriber

information, or where setting the direct route between the SSP and the IP includes sending an

initial address message from a service switch function (SSF) of the SSP to a specialized resource

function (SRF) of the IP, and sending an address complete message or an answer message from

the SRF to the SSF for transmitting the announcement of the service to the subscriber.

The Examiner admits that Svennesson et al. does not disclose or suggest these

limitations, but asserts that McConnell et al. discloses these limitations in Fig. 1, SSP 16, Fig. 4,

IP 36 and IP 120, and col. 9 lines 11-28 and col. 19 lines 28-65. However, these portions of

McConnell merely disclose that a switch determines that the call should be routed via an

outbound loop around trunk to the destination IP address specified by the SCP and when the IP

receives the IAM message from the switch, it may consult the SCP to receive instructions for

proceeding and, in the case of an account balance call to learn the available account balance, and

that in response to a message from the IP, the SCP may report to the IP the available account

balance which the IP may subsequently announce to the mobile station. This is not announcing

the service to a subscriber using the direct route between the SSP and the IP, without using the

SCP to announce the service and collecting and processing subscriber information, as recited in

the claims of the present application. Clearly, McConnell discloses involvement of the SCP

during the process. McConnell merely relates to the SCP identifying a call as a predefined type

of call and then approving the switch (from which the call is received) can be made to route the

call via a loop around trunk, regardless of the subscribers number. In McConnell, the

subscribers are signed up for a special service such as account balance calling and the SCP

determines that the call is of a predefined type of call, namely a call to be treated according to

the special service (see, col. 8 lines 59-col. 9 line 9). Therefore, McConnell teaches away from

the limitations in the claims of the present application in that there is no need to announce the

service to a subscriber since the subscriber is already signed up for a special service.

Moreover, McConnell relates to a special service such as account balance calling. This is

not a conference call supplemental service, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Further, McConnell does not disclose or suggest announcing the conference call supplemental

call to a subscriber using the direct route between the SSP and the IP, without using the SCP.

McConnell et al does not disclose or suggest announcing a service to a subscriber.

Moreover, McConnell does not disclose or suggest where the setting the direct route

between the SSP and IP includes sending and initial address message from a service switch

function of the SSP to a specialized resource function of the IP, as recited in the claims of the

present application. The portions of McConnell et al. cited by the Examiner do not disclose or

suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. In addition, McConnell does

not disclose or suggest sending an address complete message or an answer message from the

SRF to the SSF for transmitting the announcement of the service to the subscriber.

Regarding claims 5, 7, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 23 and 24, Applicant submits that these claims

are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 22 and, therefore, are patentable at

least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. For example,

Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where establishing the

temporary connection between the SCP and the IP includes sending a request message from a

service control function of the SCP to a service switch function of the SSP, or where the route

between the SSP and the IP is used to collect information from the subscriber necessary to

perform the conference calling service, and to provide an announcement service.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any

proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

each of claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23 and 24 of the present application.

Applicant respectfully requests these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 2-4 8, 13, 14, 16 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Svennesson et al. and McConnell et al. in view of Eaton et al. Applicant

respectfully traverses these rejections.

Eaton et al. discloses a voice processing interface for a teleconference system having

screened introductions, named introductions, roll call, talker identification, and subconferencing,

scheduling and recording options. A caller attempting to join a teleconference is prompted to

enter identification information. The identification information is used to index the caller's

profile stored in memory that includes the spoken name of the caller. The caller's identification

is checked to determine whether the caller is to be admitted to the teleconference. If the caller is

admitted, an announcement is generated to the attendees using the caller's spoken name

retrieved from memory, and when the attendee leaves the conference, the system retrieves the

attendees spoken name in order to generate an announcement to the attendees of his departure.

Regarding claims 2-4, 8, 13, 14, 16, and 21, Applicant submits that these claims are

dependent on one of independent claims 1, 9, and 15 and, therefore, are patentable at least for

the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that

Eaton et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Svennesson et

al. and McConnell et al. For example, Applicant submits that none of the cited references

disclose or suggest dialing a service code by a requesting subscriber, translating the dial code by

an originating station, and routing the code to a service switch function of the SSP with numbers

of subscribers who will participate in the conference call to initiate the conference calling service,

or where analyzing the call and driving the conference calling service logic program include

sending an initial detection point message from a service switch function of the SSP to a service

control function of the SCP.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken on alone or in

any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

each of claims 2-4, 8, 13, 14, 16 and 21 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request

that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7-

9, 11-18, and 20-24 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such

claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would

place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the

undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **09/897,972**
Amdt. dated <u>Proposed</u>
Reply to Office Action of <u>October 6, 2005</u>

Docket No. **P-0200**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DCO/FDB:rlg
Date: January 4, 2006

<u>Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610</u>

19